## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to the newly amended independent claims 1, 4, and 5 each of the claims will send or block the transport of files based on the presence of a security tag. More specifically, the action to send a file and the action to block the sending of the same file is based on the determination of the non presence of a security tag in the file. These claims suggest performing two distinct and different actions based on the same determination result.

Further, dependent claim 2 appears to contradict step (b) in independent claim 1. Specifically, claim 2 requires the device to block sending of the file when the security tag is present in the file.

The other dependent claims (3 and 6) do not provide limitations that alleviate the confusion with independent claim 1. Therefore, all the claims are rejected for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A. Howard et al (US 20070199063) disclose a system for controlling access to content over a network.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew B. Smithers whose telephone number is (571) 272-3876. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30) EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel L. Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Matthew B Smithers/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2437